

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2, 4-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 35, and 36 are pending in the application, and stand rejected as allegedly being indefinite pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. The Office action asserts that claims 2, 4-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 35, and 36 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. The Office action's direction for placing claims 2, 4-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 35, and 36 in condition for allowance is appreciated.

In this paper, claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 35, and 36 have been amended to eliminate the grounds for rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, and to correct typographic errors.

The amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendment to the claims which has been made in this Amendment and Response, and which has not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art or 35 U.S.C. §112, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claims 2, 4-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is traversed.

The Office action asserts that "Claims 35 and 36 claim a side-mounted rearview mirror assembly and a vehicular mirror mounting assembly, but the claims contain limitations to the mounting surface of the vehicle. It is unclear whether the mounting surface of the vehicle is being claimed."

The mounting surface is not claimed. The claims have been amended to eliminate any uncertainty as to scope; for example, the definite article "the" has been replaced with the indefinite

article “a” where appropriate. Other amendments have been made to remove limitations concerning the mounting surface that might lead to uncertainty as to whether the mounting surface is claimed.

Applicants submit that the amendments in this paper eliminate the grounds for rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, thereby placing the claims in condition for allowance as asserted in the Office action. Applicants therefor request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 2, 4-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 35, and 36.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, claims 2, 4-6, 9-12, 14-19, 35, and 36 are allowable. If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. Early notification of allowability is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

IAN BODDY ET AL.

Dated: February 24, 2009

By: /Michael F Kelly/

Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
G. Thomas Williams, Reg. No. 42,228
MCGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market Avenue SW, Suite 500
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
mfk@mcgarrybair.com